DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 142 878 CG 011 607

AUTHOR Nowliss, Helen H.
TITLE [Statement Before the Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse, Committee on Human Resources, United States Senate.]
PUB DATE 24 Mar 77
NOTE 18p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavioral Science Research; Communication Skills; *Community Problems; Counseling; *Drug Education; *Educational Programs; *Federal Programs; Marihuana; Narcotics; *Prevention; Program Descriptions; Secondary Education; Social Sciences; *Team Training

ABSTRACT

The Drug Education Program is funded by Education Personnel Development funds from the Office of Education. Its goals are: (1) reinforcing non-use of drugs; (2) discouraging experimentation; and (3) preventing or intervening in destructive uses of all substances. Its philosophy emphasizes both use and non-use of substances as behavior, and looks to behavioral and social sciences for ways of understanding and influencing those behaviors. This paper reports on the activities of the program since its inception in 1970. After setting up some pilot programs, the group decided that its most effective role would be one of leadership, training and resources. It therefore set up a network of five regional resource centers, which offer training to small teams from many local communities. During training, teams are exposed to a broad range of activities, including needs assessment, program planning, team building, group, individual and peer counseling alternatives to substance abuse, communication skills, problem-solving, decision-making and conflict resolution skills and skills in marshalling local support for their programs. After returning to the community, teams implement counseling, teacher training, workshops and other activities suited to their area's needs. Many teams have been successful, but the need in this area is still very great. (BP)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED142878

CG

FOR RELEASE UPON DELIVERY

Statement by
Helen H. Nowlis, Ph.D.
Director, Alcohol and Drug
Abuse Education Programs
Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education
U.S. Office of Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Before the
Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse
Committee on Human Resources
United States Senate
Thursday, March 24, 1977
9:30 a.m.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CG 011607

Early in 1970 the Office of Education was directed, as part of the Federal agencies' response to what was defined as a serious national problem, to invest $3.0 million in developing and supporting a prevention capability for training classroom teachers in 55 States and territories with Education Personnel Development funds. At that time it was the unanimous opinion of some 30 individuals assembled to advise the effort that the traditional reliance on providing information about the dangers of drugs and their effects and the legal consequences of illegal drug use was at best ineffective, at worst counterproductive. This group included both students and adults who were close to various aspects of the youth drug scene and involved in prevention and early intervention efforts in both schools and community. Research, both here and abroad, has since supported this opinion.

From its inception the Drug Education Program has emphasized both use and non-use of substances as behavior and has turned to the behavioral and social sciences for approaches to understanding and influencing those behaviors.

The goals of the program were set as: 1) reinforcing non-use, 2) discouraging experimentation and 3) preventing or intervening in destructive use of all substances. Its strategies were drawn from the basic principles of learning, motivation, growth and development, communication, and from existing research on a variety of deviant and destructive behaviors, including destructive drug and alcohol use. Its primary targets were the adults who daily influence the growth and development of young people and shape the institutions or groups

in which this growth occurs - the family, the school, and the community. These remain the same seven years later.

During this initial period the Program offered four weeks of intensive training to teams of five to seven individuals, including students, from each State that would prepare them to return and set in motion state-wide in-service training programs that would reach educational personnel in local schools. This effort was supported by grants to State Education Departments.

Late in 1970 the Drug Abuse Education Act (P.L. 91-527) was passed, and what had been envisaged as a fifteen-month effort directed to in-service training for teachers became a three-year effort with a greatly expanded mandate. The Program was to develop, validate and disseminate community strategies as well as school-based programs. By the end of FY 1970 the Program had funded in-service training and curriculum development projects in 55 States and territories and 57 school-based, college-based and community-based projects to develop innovative approaches to alcohol and drug abuse prevention.

Before these demonstration projects had run their course, a rapidly increasing demand from schools and communities for help and support in developing effective responses to the drug problem led to an increase in appropriation for the Program from $6.0 (FY 71) to $12.4 (FY 72) million dollars. The Program was reluctant to initiate new demonstration projects with the 57 already funded having only one year of experience. The typical four to five years from initiation to implementation to replication to dissemination did not respond to the widespread and urgent need. It was also becoming evident on

the basis of the many programs and projects that had been initiated, with or without Federal funding, that drug and alcohol use is influenced by many psychological, social, cultural and institutional factors, the patterns of which vary from community to community. Although it is only human to wish that a solution, once found, would be the answer to every school's or community's problem, it is equally human that people and institutions and problems differ from place to place and from time to time.

On the basis of its experience and its best current information on need, on understanding of the problem, and on assessment of the state of the art, the Program made the following decisions:

1. Given limited resources relative to demand, the most effective role for the Program at the Federal level would be a leadership, training, resource role.

2. Its immediate goal would be to set in motion in as many communities as possible a process and a core of skilled people that would enable each setting to implement an alcohol and drug abuse prevention program tailored to its carefully defined problem and its human and financial resources and at the same time would provide an ongoing capability for addressing other problems of concern, present, or future.

3. It would continue to support and to monitor carefully the progress of the 112 State and local based demonstration projects for the normal three-year period.

Beginning in FY 1972 the Program set up an interdependent network of seven (now five) regional training, resource, developmental assistance centers to train and provide technical assistance to teams of from five to seven individuals chosen to represent the various elements of the schools or communities from which they come. Community teams were given small grants to cover expenses involved in attending two-week residential training and for substitute pay during the two-week period. These have averaged from $3,000 to $5,000 over the years. School teams receive in addition part-time support for the team coordinator during the year following training, bringing the average grant to school teams to $8,000 to $10,000.

During training, teams are exposed to a broad range of activities, including needs assessment, program planning, team building, group, individual and peer counseling, alternatives to substance abuse, communication skills, problem-solving, decision-making and conflict-resolution skills and skills in marshalling local support for their programs.

Teams are given a basic understanding of alcohol and drugs and what they do and of young people and what they do. They learn to assess the needs and expectations of the youth population to be served, to formulate realistic objectives for meeting those needs, and to identify human and financial resources in their school and community for supporting a prevention program. Finally, each team evaluates the range of prevention materials and methods available and adapts those which are appropriate tools for its goals and its particular school district or community setting. Each team leaves training with an action plan tailored to their goals for their school or community. Technical

assistance and further on-site training are available from the centers for up to two years, depending on the level of Program funding available.

Since 1972 the centers have trained and provided follow-up assistance to approximately 3,000 schools and school-communities. These teams represent approximately 16,000 educational personnel, students and out-of-school youth and personnel from law enforcement, health and social service agencies, civic and church leaders, parents and State and Federal personnel. Programs set up by these teams impact approximately 1,000,000 individuals annually.

The following activities are those most often implemented by school teams, and the percent of teams involved in each activity. (Most teams are involved in more than one activity).

1. Counseling (programs using adult counselors or youth as "peer" counselors, which help students solve personal problems).....91%

2. Teacher training (to increase teacher effectiveness in working with youth to reduce self-destructive behaviors, especially alcohol and drug abuse).....62%

3. Workshops (seminars and group discussions with youth, helping them to explore personal needs and make more responsible decisions).....47%

4. Curriculum development.....47%

5. Information services (dissemination activities through literature, libraries, and resource centers).....45%

6. Assessment (surveys conducted to identify student needs and local resources).....45%

7. Student training (leadership training, training youth as counselors).....34%

8. Programs providing alternatives to drug use for meeting needs of young people (such as outdoor recreation, crafts, music, and yoga).....32%

9. Family programs (those involving parents and families in discussion groups or counseling).....24%

A survey of 556 FY 1973 community-school teams during 1975, commissioned by the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention, reported that:

1. Over half of the teams were still functioning as a team and nearly 80% reported that programs they had started were continuing

2. Teams were effective in tailoring their programs to their target groups

3. Ninety percent recommended the training for others in drug abuse prevention

4. Only eight percent of the teams reported no activity

5. Over one-third of the teams secured a total of $5,329,000 to support their activities. This represents an average of $9,585 for every team in the study

6. Teams reported initiating or influencing over 2,875 prevention programs

These findings closely parallel those of a more intensive 1975 study of a sample of 33 school teams trained in FY 1974 and followed from actual training through a year back in their own community, with a telephone follow-up interview in 1976.

1. 82% of the teams reported relevant or on-going activities that could be directly traced to the team

2. A large number of teams were more involved and committed and were becoming institutionalized into the system

3. Expanded team initiated programs and activities were reaching more students, in more classes in more schools.

4. Training has placed in the schools a large group of skilled and dedicated people

There are now teams in every State and territory, the number varying from 164 in California, 137 in New York and 125 in Texas to 15 to 25 in the smaller States. These teams have formed networks, many times under the leadership of the State Education Department or Single State Agency or both. They share experience and expertise.

That teams do function, do set-up programs and processes that are supported by their schools and communities is well-documented. But this is only part of the story. Except in very large school districts, which are the Program's 1977 challenge, a trained team from one school will develop programs which spread to all other schools in a district, even to schools in neighboring districts.

A team from a school district with a 95 percent Mexican-American population and located in one of the poorest counties in the country reports decreases in vandalism and absenteeism, fewer incidents of alcohol and drug abuse and higher morale in both teachers and students as a result of district-wide workshops on communication skills, parent effectiveness training, new techniques for facilitating parent-teacher conferences, greatly increased recreational opportunities and alternative vocational and avocational instruction.

A team from a school district in an agricultural community located near a large state university, "where students can buy anything they want" changed the total school climate by creating better teacher-student and parent-teacher relationships that emphasized self-control and personal responsibility in all inter-personal relationships. They report:

A drop in drug and alcohol related offenses to zero
A drop of over 50 percent in discipline referrals
A decrease in drop-outs of 30 percent
A drop in class cuts of 50 percent

The program is now being evaluated by the Department of Behavioral Sciences from the near-by university.

A school team from a predominantly Black mid-western high school set-up a Student Services Center with a vigorous Outreach Program that identified the need for an elementary program. A second team was trained to address this need. The second team expanded the original team's peer listening program into all junior and senior high schools and, with the combined skills and resources of team members, students, parents and district personnel, developed a K-6 curriculum which is being adapted by three other school districts and is used by a near-by university in the training of student teachers. Although "all of us know, subjectively, that we have seen changes in the students" those changes are now being measured.

What starts as a school district program spreads out to other parts of the community resulting in community-wide impact.

A team from a high school in an industrial city of 175,000 developed a counseling and training program for its own students and those from its feeder junior high school designed to help both students and faculty develop and utilize effective life coping skills. Twenty-five of 750 students and 12 teachers trained in communication skills, positive self-concept development and alternatives to destructive behavior were employed by the city Manpower Administration to work with 1,400 in the 1976 Summer Youth Program. The total trained group will work with the total manpower staff of 5,000 in the Summer of 1977. The team has raised $38,000 to date to support its activities.

Two teams trained in 1974 and 1975, from a city school district of 31,000 students, have expanded their programs to all 43 schools in the district. One thousand of 1,400 school personnel have been trained and 25,000 of 31,000 students are participating in activities initiated by team members. The team has been hired by the community college to teach a well-attended parent education program. Formal evaluation of the impact on alcohol and drug abuse and other destructive behaviors of the program is underway.

Its next projects are an alternative to suspension program and a joint program with the Central Intake Section of the State Juvenile Court.

Three teams of school personnel from the Archdiocese of a large midwestern metropolitan area not only developed a 4-year substance abuse curriculum for the high school, conducted workshops for

students, staff and parents, set-up a peer counseling program, and identified available alternatives to drug/alcohol abuse but also developed an interface with similar programs in their feeder schools. The three teams have become the moving force in a diocesan-wide umbrella organization that provides sources of information, education training, counseling, referral and coordination with other agencies for the prevention, early intervention, treatment and after care of clinically dependent persons. Their target population includes 5,000 families and 8,700 students. Over the past four years the group has raised $145,396. The original OE investment was $5,187 plus technical assistance.

A community team often combines with a school team to develop programs that have a major impact on a whole community. It would seem that once skills have been developed, and they have been used successfully in one venture, there may be no limit to the ability and willingness, if not appetite, to attack other problems.

Beginning in 1972, in a lower or middle income city of 33,000 a community team, followed by a school team and a police team trained at police department expense, have combined forces and expanded their membership to include 300 people. Together they have:

- Developed a drug abuse prevention curriculum and accompanying programs for all schools, grades K-12.
- Hired a full-time social worker, with CETA funds, to set up a Crisis Home System for court bound youth. Twenty-eight of 30 youths were successfully diverted.
- Received a grant from the State LEA to train 13 other communities in setting up Crisis Home Systems.
- Conducted an annual Outdoors Activity program for youth in difficulty with school or police.
- Conducted workshops for teachers, counselors, administrators and school board members to define problems in the school system and work jointly to solve them.
- Established a crisis intervention team to handle serious adolescent suicide attempts.

- Trained senior citizens to work with students in elementary, middle and high school classes.

- Served as consultants to innumberable other communities and police departments.

Police report an 80 percent reduction in vandalism, merchants report a dramatic reduction in loitering, fewer criminal arrests among young people, fewer disruptions in schools, greatly improved relationship among schools, police, community members, youth and parents.

Over the five years of the team training program, as other agencies such as NIDA and NIAAA have become increasingly involved in prevention activities and with the passage of the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Amendments of 1974 (P.L. 93-422), the Program has shifted its major training effort from school-communities to its natural constituency, the school and related educational agencies and professional associations. This is the constituency with which the Office of Education has long had experience and credibility and to which it has natural access.

Although still convinced that school and community must work closely together this shift in emphasis was a comfortable one. Young people spend (or are supposed to spend) virtually half of their waking life in school, and the school and the peer group assembled therein are increasingly important forces affecting the socialization of young people. It is a major arena in which they develop, or fail to develop, the personal, social life-coping skills so essential to functioning as an adult. Recent research has suggested that the way in which a classroom teacher interacts with each student and group of students is one of the most important factors in personal and social development, regardless of formal instructional responsibilities.

For this reason a second major program thrust since 1973 has been the training of future teachers with the objective of encouraging changes in the programs of teacher training institutions so that their graduates, the future elementary and secondary school teachers, will be better prepared to respond to the needs and problems of young people which may lead to alcohol and drug abuse. It recognizes that effective alcohol and drug abuse education for future teachers is not simply information about substance--that teachers who know how to communicate better with students, make decisions consistent with their values, work toward fulfillment of personal goals, and look at their behavior objectively can help young people learn these skills for dealing with alcohol and drug abuse and other behavior problems.

There are two basic modes in which teacher training institutions have been able to participate in the preservice program area--as Conference Teams or as Model Projects. One research project has also been supported.

In 1973 and 1974 a series of three Conferences were held at which a total of 180 teams of five from Schools of Education throughout the country came together for a three and a half day training experience. The teams were composed of administrators, faculty and students. Other than a limited number of travel scholarships and travel subsistence at the Conferences no other financial support was available to the teams. Postconference technical assistance was, however, possible through the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education National Action Committee.

Only very few of the teams were unable to function in any significant capacity when they returned to their campuses. A gratifying number were able to introduce curriculum revisions and innovations. Many trained other faculty in affective approaches to alcohol and drug abuse education through sponsorship of conferences, seminars and workshops. One team in Wyoming went beyond the University to involve State Education Agency personnel and was instrumental in the training of inservice teachers in a number of local school districts. Another team from New York State received State funds to develop innovative curricular materials which are being used at the undergraduate level in a number of colleges and universities in the State.

In 1974 six demonstration models and one research project were funded at Schools of Education for a three-year commitment. These represented substantially greater support (approximately $180,000 per model over a three-year period) to six institutions to develop and institutionalize models for the preservice preparation of teachers. Underlying the research project was the hypothesis that people at higher levels of self-knowledge are less likely to develop self destructive response patterns and that strategies for increasing levels of self-knowledge could be developed into appropriate curricular objectives.

Each of the six demonstration models was selected for support because it represented a situation in some way unique from the others. One originated from a Department of Counselor Education in a Competency Based Teacher Education institution; one in the Professional Sequence in the Department of Educational Psychology; another is a joint effort between a School of

Education and an outside project of the Archdiocese of Boston. Two offer alternative tracks for prospective teachers with more field involvement and a closer faculty-student relationship; one focuses on alternative placements in inner city schools, halfway houses for young delinquents and alcohol and drug abusers and alternative schools; another has concentrated on field placements with alienated, mostly Chicano, youth.

Although the projects have evolved in different ways, from different areas, and have concentrated their energies differently, all have worked toward common objectives in creating change within their institutions in the preparation of teachers to reflect and model those qualities so desired for young teachers. This has involved commitment and cooperation of administration in the change process; faculty participation in training and upgrading of skills; student involvement of local schools and teachers in a cooperative effort with the Schools of Education.

The six demonstration projects involve Schools of Education at: Boston College, Mankato (Minnesota) State University, University of Northern Iowa, University of Missouri, University of Houston and University of California at Santa Cruz.

The seventh project, at the Humanistic Cluster of the School of Education, University of Massachusetts, has been developing a careful and well grounded method of measuring the growth of personal knowledge. Its objectives have been: (1) to diagnose the existing level of a person's self knowledge; (2) to develop appropriate curriculum objectives and curriculum packages for use by teachers; and (3) to evaluate the results of this work.

Federal support for the six model projects and the one research project terminates in June 1977. The model projects will, however, continue in place in their respective institutions with local support. It is significant to note that those observing the products (future classroom teachers) of this demonstration effort see a distinct difference in their ability to relate to young peop'e in the classroom.

The research project has developed curricular materials which are presently being used in a number of schools in New England and has trained a number of classroom teachers in their use. The State of Maine has become interested in the curricular materials and is planning to implement them on a statewide basis.

In April 1977, a Conference will be held here in Washington to disseminate the results of the models and the research project to interested Deans of Schools of Education from around the country. In addition, plans are underway to disseminate the projects in a national publication. They will also be visible at a number of regional and state conferences. There is good reason, therefore, to assume that these projects supported with modest Federal funding will have an impact on many more institutions than those directly involved in their development.

A third element in the Program from its inception has been the National Action Committee. Its major function has been to make available to all parts of the Program technical assistance of the highest level of expertise. This has included technical assistance in a wide variety of areas to demonstration projects, to training centers, to State agencies, to the Program itself and

to non-Program education-related efforts to the extent of its resources. It has played a particularly important role in helping facilitate and implement coordinated planning among the various agencies in a State concerned with education, substance abuse and youth service agencies. It responds to requests from State Education Agencies and Single State Agencies to respond to problems that seem to "fall between the cracks." A second important function is to provide the expertise and to do the spade work necessary to the development of new Program thrusts as they are identified.

Training is constantly modified on the basis of the experience of teams and the identification of needs for technical assistance, as well as developments in other programs. Experience is mounting nationwide that supports the proposition that positive growth and development are the basic ingredients in supporting non-use, discouraging experimental use and preventing destructive use of substances, as well as the prevention of other self or socially destructive behaviors. Training for promoting positive growth and development helps educators and parents understand their roles as guides to the behavior of young people; it develops in trainees the decison-making and problem solving skills to help young people make sense of their learning and their environment; it helps young and old alike to make sense of life and gives them life-coping skills.

Most surveys and reports suggest that drug abuse may currentiy be leveling off but remains at an unacceptably high level, especially among young people. They also suggest that regular use of alcohol is increasing dramatically among school-age youth and that they are getting involved at younger age levels.

The history of alcohol and drug abuse would suggest the problem will never go away and that prevention efforts should always be ongoing.

While no one is suggesting that Federal funding for prevention efforts be continued indefinitely, it is essential that Federal leadership efforts continue to the point where sufficient ongoing capability exists. In the networks currently developing within the States among USOE trained teams and among USOE Regional Training Centers and State Education Agencies as well as the Single State Agencies we see the potential for such capability.

The current demand from schools for assistance in this area is, however, enormous. The Office of Education Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program has the experience and well established mechanisms to respond to this critical need.

As a footnote, the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program is one of two Office of Education programs selected to test the effectiveness of its system, its team training model and its strategies in helping schools prevent and reduce school crime and violence under an interagency agreement with the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Eighty school-community teams will have been trained by the end of this mohth and will be back in their communities with action plans tailored to their needs and their resources.